DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 419 186 CG 028 422

AUTHOR Steward, Robbie J.
TITLE Helping Counselor Trainees Get Along: An Issue for Professional Development.
PUB DATE 1998-03-28
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the American Counseling Association World Conference (Indianapolis, IN, March 28 - April 1, 1998).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; *Conflict Resolution; Counseling; *Counselor Training; Cultural Pluralism; Diversity (Faculty); Diversity (Student); *Graduate Students; Higher Education; Interpersonal Relationship; Intervention; Norms; Prevention; Professional Development; Program Implementation; Role

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a programmatic strategy to address unresolved student-student disagreements. The paper examines cultural norms--within training programs in academic settings--that contribute to interpersonal problems among students. It describes the following norms as related to some stated principles for negotiating diversity: (1) program faculty, as a collective, should not manage relationship problems among students; (2) perspectives represented by the majority of a group, whether student or faculty cohorts, are meaningful perspectives; (3) all issues of difference should be addressed and resolved within the confines of multicultural or diversity related counseling courses; (4) increasing the representation of diversity among faculty and student cohorts is the most important end; (5) all faculty share the same level of access to power and resources and professional status within the system and within the profession; (6) all students have the competency to resolve "cross-cultural collisions" that are guaranteed to occur within training programs; (7) interpersonal conflict among peers is abnormal and reflects pathology; (8) being an effective practitioner with diverse client populations and having an interest in multicultural counseling as a specialty automatically translates into being able to develop and maintain effective working relationships with colleagues and vice versa. Some of the students' and faculty members' responses to conflicts that decrease the probability of optimal outcomes are described, and a programmatic model for prevention and intervention of "cross-cultural collisions" among trainees is provided. Potential barriers are outlined and a programmatic proposal for addressing group diversity among trainees is presented. (MKA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 419 186

Running Head: Multicultural Counseling and Development

Helping Counselor Trainees Get along:

An Issue for Professional Development

Robbie J. Steward

Associate Professor

Michigan State University

Department of Counseling and Educational Psychology

436 Erickson Hall

East Lansing, MI 48824

517-432-1524 (Office)

517-353-6393 (FAX)

devine@pilot.msu.edu

Presented at the American Counseling Association 1998 World Conference

as part of a symposium entitled

"Integrating Theory, Research, Training, and Practice toward

Multicultural Competence"

Indianapolis, Indiana

CG028422

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Submitted for review as an ERIC Publication

April 6, 1998

R. STEWARD

2A

Helping Counselor Trainees Get along:

An Issue for Professional Development

Abstract

Currently, there is no full-faculty, programmatic model for prevention of or intervention with acute and long-term interpersonal problems among trainees. The primary purpose of this symposium is to present a programmatic strategy to address unresolved student-student conflicts. This will be accomplished by including the following in this presentation: 1) an overview of cultural norms within training programs in academic settings that contribute to interpersonal problems among students; 2) a presentation of students' and faculty members' responses to student-student conflicts that decrease the probability of optimal outcomes; 3) a description of a programmatic model for prevention and intervention of "cross-cultural collisions" among trainees; and 4) a discussion of potential barriers to implementation.

Helping Counselor Trainees Get along:

An Issue for Professional Development

Introduction

Professional Organizations', universities', colleges', and training programs' commitment to attend to diversity in terms of awareness, knowledge, and skills in service delivery might be considered a critical professional theme across the last two decades. In response to what began as a few strong voices within the profession turning into a powerful force, the professional world of higher education has been altered significantly. To increase the significantly lower representation of racial/ethnic diversity within training programs and among current practitioners and educators, colleges and universities are increasing recruitment efforts as a means of correction. Many training programs are requiring, or at least including within offered curriculum, course work that addresses diversity related to racial/ethnic, gender, sexual orientation, and social-economic status. A plethora of research and scholarship addressing diversity in service delivery and education has led to: the development of new diversity-focused journals and professional conferences; the development of diversity related special issues in mainstream journals; and, related themes highlighted within professional conferences. Increasing numbers of White trainees and academicians, who compose the majority of all professionals within universities and colleges within this country, are choosing some specific area within the multicultural counseling literature as a specialty area. I believe that it can be said, without hesitation, that there is significant evidence that 'attending to diversity' is a phrase that characterizes teaching, research/scholarship, service delivery, and program development within many college settings.

As a woman and member of a racial/ethnic group in this country, I am pleased about the attention of higher education and counseling in particular, to racism and sexism. Counselor trainees who are members of racial/ethnic groups or special populations not represented within mainstream America will certainly benefit from seeing senior members of the profession (i.e., faculty, student personnel staff) who are more like them in terms of background and culture. Increasing the number of graduate trainees, and consequently increasing the number of professionals, will increase the probability of clients being able to choose to have a counselor who might best understand their day to day experiences. Research and scholarship addressing diversity related issues will certainly add clarity to our current understanding of the process and outcome of training and service delivery. It is quite apparent to me that multicultural counseling is important and relevant to the changing complexion and cultural transition that is constantly occurring within general social structure.

Those institutions and training programs that have successfully implemented diversity related curriculum and program development should be applauded for such efforts. Those training programs and institutions that have successfully recruited diverse faculty and student cohorts over a period of time are noteworthy of mention. This positive attention is certainly warranted and those who have not been as successful at doing the above can certainly learn from these success stories of recruitment. However, is the existence of diversity within university faculty, staff, and student cohorts sufficient? Exactly how prepared are traditional, predominantly White settings prepared for the influx of diversity within a culture that has not openly addressed diversity?

Though entire university infrastructure might be appropriately included in the focus of this paper, I am choosing to focus only on one small part of the university infrastructure,

graduate programs within student personnel or counseling programs. Given that within this discipline lies the skills and competency in attending to the personal needs of others based upon an understanding of human development, and that within these disciplines we have publicly purported a professional commitment to multicultural counseling competence, it seems most critical that it is within this setting that we might begin discussion of what is, what is not, and what needs to be.

An Overview of Cultural Norms with Graduate Training Programs in Counseling

What is often overlooked in the search to correct the visible indicators of the absence of diversity (i.e., diverse faculty representation, recruitment and admission of diverse student cohorts, the inclusion of diversity related counseling courseware) is the identification of the traditional cultural norms within graduate programs. Like many majority group members who have not, until having received some form of diversity training, acknowledged racial or cultural group membership, training programs might also make such an error of oversight. Past and current practices within graduate education can be perceived as 'normal' and not worthy of mention. As a faculty member, I see no malevolence in this blind spot. On the other hand, I see the blind spot as the result of what can typically occur in the face of external and/or internal challenges to correct past and current systemic injustices, prejudices, and discrimination. Microsystems might move prematurely toward the appearance of change in relationship to diversity prior to a process of introspection and self- study of what cultural norms might be altered to create a climate that best accommodates increased diversity within a setting. Even in efforts to do the right thing, painful outcomes can ensue if the right thing is not done more thoughtfully and completely.

The implications for this oversight can be significant for both those students most recently admitted as well as current students. Those who are recruited are invited into settings in which the members have not clearly defined what behaviors are taboo and what behaviors are deemed most culturally appropriate and salient. Expectations to develop and maintain close friendships with both faculty and students can be frustrated by differences in comfort and familiarity with similar academic settings, social class background, racial/ethnic group membership, racial/ethnic identity, religion, degree of status and acceptance by members of majority group members, etc. Guilt or feelings of inadequacy for not being able or willing to develop and maintain such relationships can occur. On the other hand, guilt for developing and maintaining positive relationships with others might occur due to external negative interpretations by majority and minority group members. White faculty and students may not value White students who develop primary working alliances with minority faculty and students; minority faculty and students may be somewhat suspicious of minority students and faculty who fail to develop working alliances with minority faculty and students or who do not choose to attend to diversity within the context of their research and professional development. Aside from differences in racial/ethnic alliances, students who appear to have somehow developed closer working alliances with those perceived as having access to greater power and/or status may experience similar guilt and negative reactions from peers. New students entering training programs may be penalized because of their ignorance of what might happen in the training environment due to exposure to differences that typically do not occur within the general society.

On the other hand, for the first time in their lives, those students who have had the privilege of majority group membership within a predominantly majority group setting might become confused by the sudden requirement of being 'respectful' or at least openly tolerant to

peers in close proximity who are different in not only skin color, but values, beliefs, and attitudes for the first time in their lives. Course work addressing multicultural counseling or diversity related topics with representatives of the discussed groups present may highlight points of diversity and related tension among Whites that might not have occurred otherwise. Steward, Morales, Bartell, Miller, & Weeks (1998) found that exposure to diversity related content can force White trainees to see each other differently and in some cases in very negative terms.

In addition, even those who have experience of being effective with counseling 'diverse' client populations might be uniquely challenged by the exposure to racially different colleagues. This might be particularly true within student cohorts consisting of majority group members being the least represented. Steward, Davidson, & Borgers (1993) found that Whites as a racial minority will tend to decrease their normal interpersonal 'engaging' behaviors in predominantly racial/ethnic minority settings even though the expectation of others remain the same in both situations. Ignoring cultural norms in graduate training programs that are directly related to diversity can, at least, facilitate the development and maintenance of a climate of silence and alienation, or at most, result in the personal and psychological damage of the student cohort. Student morale can be negatively effected by faculty avoidance.

Such outcomes indicated above can negatively influence group dynamics and the training climate in the absence of faculty discussion, clarification, intervention, and assistance. It appears that cultural collisions can occur not only between persons of color and their White peers, but also among persons of color and students of Anglo descent (Steward, et al, 1995). Being open to discuss and address how current practices might diminish or negate the positive outcomes that can come from the experience of heightened diversity within a training setting appears critical. However, faculty themselves may not have experienced those sensitive discussions related to

differences among them and consequently remain incompetent in attending to and resolving what Steward, Gimenez, & Jackson (1995) identified as 'cultural collisions'. Many faculty might not have even had any multicultural counseling training, and if they have, they might not have ever maintained an effective working alliance with culturally different colleagues. For whatever reasons, faculty failing to address these differences and the impact of this silence on the psychological climate might result in the trickling down of incompetence and avoidance of critical learning experiences. Professional development experiences that can result only from appropriately attending to critical within group differences among peers remains absent from training.

Though there many be many more cultural norms that are worthy of attention, I will note only a few that are directly related to principles reflected within the proposed guidelines for negotiating diversity that will be presented later in this paper. Each statement indicates unspoken beliefs that I believe: guide much of faculty activity and involvement with each other and with students; and, may contribute to the unnecessary and heightened tension associated with diverse graduate counseling training environments:

1. **Program faculty, as a collective, should not assume any role in managing relationship problems among students.** In other words, there is no need for programmatic intervention for the professional development of insensitive and/or disrespectful trainees. This allows the training climate to be primarily the result of students' unpredictable ability to develop and maintain effective working alliances within diverse settings. In some extreme cases, advisors are alerted by other faculty of problem relationships involving his or her advisees, and the advisor is expected to attend to the issues individually with advisees. The outcome is that faculty as a whole do not relay a collective message of 'correction' to students, and the degree to

which students feel supported or not supported may be based on the perspective of the advisor, the response of their advisor, and the status of their advisor among other faculty..

2. **Perspectives represented by the majority of a group, whether student or faculty cohorts, are the most accurate and meaningful perspectives.** This view is quite typical within a democratic setting and often perceived as fair. However, in very diverse settings, a majority might not be maintained and the development of several factions occur. In the worse possible case, a large faction might become stable and long-standing to the degree that other less represented perspectives remain unheard. This is particularly true in the case of a student faction, regardless of the size, that is supported by a faculty member or members who have greater power status within the program.

Another outcome of paying attention to this democratic process is the neglect of the possibility that the majority can be wrong or at least in need of intervention, too. For example, if somehow one member of a student cohort becomes targeted as an 'insensitive' person by all other members of a cohort or at least most of them, it is clear that feedback and intervention are necessary for that individual. However, this intervention does not preclude the necessity of an intervention with those who have targeted that individual as well as an intervention that mediates between the individual and each of the parties reporting problems. It cannot be concluded that the majority is always correct, or that 'correct' is based upon the capacity of individuals to convince others of the appropriateness of their reaction.

3. **All issues of difference should be addressed and resolved within the confines of multicultural or diversity related counseling courses with the instructor of such courses assuming primary responsibility for resolution.** Some programs might be unwilling to assume the broadest definition of culture that addresses differences related group membership

(i.e., race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, etc.), but also addresses the ways of being that might differentiate same group members from one another. One outcome of this unwillingness is the perpetuation of stereotypical thinking that all members of one group are the same. Often all that group members may share are phenotype and the experience of being perceived by others as having certain qualities based on that phenotype. Steward, et al, (1995) found that in a study of personal preferences of male and female successful African-, Anglo, Asian-, and Hispanic American university students on a large predominantly White setting, the most predictable group based upon personal preferences was Hispanic males (63.6%) and the least predictable group was African American males (40%). These findings suggest that the practice of using a collective cultural norm to understand self-identified members of certain groups may be somewhat limited.

A second outcome is the perpetuation of the belief and practice that the expert in multicultural counseling training should also be the faculty member to assume the primary or sole responsibility for fixing problems that occur among trainees. This is particularly true when un-addressed differences that have surfaced in other classes are heightened in the diversity course due to the nature of the content. Once again the primary responsibility to directly address within group tension belongs to one faculty member, and not the entire program.

4. **Increasing the representation of diversity among faculty and student cohorts is the most important end.** As indicated above, a growing number of programs have significantly altered the complexion of both faculty and student cohorts. This is not to be overlooked as a minor accomplishment in the effort toward systemic change. However, some majority group faculty may perceive this outcome as a means of maintaining a professional distance to the multicultural literature and issues related to diversity. "Now that the minority

faculty are here, both the minority and the White students who are interested in such things can go to them. Let them handle all the diversity related issues."

Another outcome of this thinking is the belief in the collective sympathy and empathy across all groups of special populations. racial/ethnic and religious minority groups. One example is the use of the phrase "persons of color". Though this is a phrase that is inclusive and indicates a collective power base and experience within the general social structure, this phrase more accurately reflects a idealistic state wherein all groups experience the same degree of alienation within predominantly White settings and understand, accept, and value the experiences of the others. This is not always the case.

In addition, it can often be erroneously assumed that effective working alliances will automatically occur between disenfranchised special populations and racial/ethnic minorities. By the nature of supposed shared experiences, this should occur. While faculty may be excited about the extensive representation of a number of areas of diversity with a student cohort, tensions among persons of color and with other members of special populations (i.e., gay/lesbians, religious minorities, etc.) may not be anticipated. All faculty must become familiar and comfortable working with all students. It cannot be assumed that all minorities are the same or that minorities and members of special populations will always develop effective working alliances.

5. **All faculty share the same level of access to power and resources and professional status within the system and within the profession.** Though the pursuit and receipt of tenure, in theory, is an equalizer in some ways and a level of professional development that is to be cherished and valued. Tenure alone does not accurately reflect the value, work load, and power status of faculty within any given academic program. This oversight is often reflected

in the cavalier practice of advisee assignment that can occur randomly or in some cases not so randomly without thought of the outcome. For example, new, Assistant level, and untenured faculty might have the same advisee assignment as the tenured full-professor. Settings wherein there is already heightened cultural diversity might become quite toxic when students' access to varying levels of power, resources, and status are evident as well. It cannot be assumed that all students share the same level of access to power and resources and status within the system and within the program. It cannot be assumed that these differences in access to perceived differences in power and status will be accepted without some resulting interpersonal tensions. The traditional nature of advisee assignment without relaying some understanding of cultural norms and the value and importance of each faculty member might support and perpetuate perceptions of program discrimination of certain students.

Practices of ignoring the power differences among faculty and relocating the responsibility of attending to and correcting diversity related conflicts among students, might lead to dead ends in resolution. This is particularly true if those perceived as the least powerful faculty members are always in or assigned the position to attend to and expected to resolve cultural conflicts among students and the most powerful faculty do not see why resolution or attention is necessary. It would seem important that all students become subject to a faculty developed programmatic guideline that dictates program expectations in collectively attending to conflicts related to diversity.

6. **All students have the competency to effectively resolve 'cross-cultural collisions' that are guaranteed to occur within training programs.** This is one that I like most of all, because in the best possible worlds, it would be true and based upon the maturity and professional and life experiences of counselor trainees. However, like faculty, many students

may not have had to work within settings wherein they are the minority, and if they have, they may have developed an unique set of coping skills that are associated with being the 'only one'. Consequently, familiarity in working with culturally different peers within an intense and highly competitive environment is nonexistent. Students may be very mature, a team player, and have extensive experience in counseling, even with culturally different and special population clientele, and not be able to effectively resolve cultural conflicts within peer relationships.

7. **Interpersonal conflict among peers is abnormal and reflects pathology in one of the parties involved; and the absence of such conflict is an indicator of healthy, learning relationships.** "Being a team player, yet able to work independently" are magical words that portray a way of being that employers, administrators, and even graduate faculty look for in letters of recommendation. However, the quality characterized by this phrase can be just that: magical. One can only feel like a team player to the degree to which they have an interpersonal style that might be characterized by others as creative, collaborative, and cooperative. The degree to which one can feel like a team player is also based on the degree to which others allow them to do so. This quality, consequently, can be influenced by the openness of the most represented or those having the greatest power status to hearing and acknowledging the presence and contribution of the 'different' group member. All students should become adept in attending to all perspectives and learning to negotiate in ways that creatively attend to all. 'Skill deficit', and not 'pathology' should be associated with being able to effectively attend to 'cultural collisions'.

8. **Being an effective practitioner with diverse client populations and having an interest in multicultural counseling as a specialty, automatically translates into being able to develop and maintain effective working alliances with colleagues and vice versa.** This

cultural assumption is reflected in the overall abundance of responsibility for one, typically 3-hour course within a training program, the multicultural counseling course. Students are to leave being effective in service delivery to each of the many racial/ethnic groups, women and men, gay and lesbian populations, etc. Exposure to multicultural counseling theory, theories of racial and ethnic identity, group culture specific knowledge, and case studies is expected to result in multicultural counseling awareness, knowledge, and skill. However, I have been in the field long enough as a faculty/researcher/practitioner to observe that many individuals complete such courses, engage in multicultural counseling research and scholarship and remain culturally insensitive with peers. It is important that we begin to separate the two competencies and require the development of competency in both areas. We must begin to focus on teaching students how to get along and we must begin to behave in a manner that it is apparent that this is a professional goal for us as academicians.

Steward, Gimenez, & Jackson (1995) recommend that faculty must develop a strategy to facilitate the effective and positive integration of all students. We concluded that fostering multicultural presence, acceptance, and appreciation, is a responsibility that all faculty must assume to create an effective learning community that models awareness and sensitivity to individual differences. There must be a collective faculty voice addressing issues of diversity with well-defined expectations, guidelines, and procedures for learning about self in relationship to others. These critical learning opportunities are uniquely provided by 'cultural collisions'.

The Appendix represents the first draft of my attempt to develop a programmatic model for effectively attending to diversity within graduate training environments within a large research institution. (Note. This draft has been revised after faculty discussion and adopted as a programmatic statement addressing the expectations of effectively negotiating 'cultural

collisions' within the program.) This model was developed in response to observations resulting from a programmatic commitment to diversity in recruitment, admissions, and commitment. It is based on the premise that in order to truly appreciate the implications of increasing diversity within a setting, cultural norms existing in some settings must shift to some degree, and significantly altered in others. It is expected that counselor trainees will become better prepared to work effectively in a changing world, and that existing faculty will become more comfortable with and assist each other in the acquisition of the skills necessary to attend to differences among themselves as well as that which will exist among students

The optimal outcome of each faculty intervention should be: 1) the discernment between 'cultural collisions' and unethical professional practice and proceed accordingly; 2) the discernment between reasonable and unreasonable expectations; 3) the **preservation** of the students involved and the perspectives presented by each; 4) the identification of points of similarity and points of dissimilarity between each of the parties involved in order to clearly define how to assist students in identifying ways to reasonably **accommodate** each others' differences; 5) to assist each of the parties in generating positive and negative professional consequences to adhering to both perspectives involved in the 'cultural collision' **(re-patterning).**

The maintenance of an ongoing working alliance through increasing the cognitive and behavioral flexibility of all trainees, is the primary objective. Though parties may not leave the discussion as friends, the outcome is to thwart any potential for faction development, alienation, and isolation, and encourage and validate a spirit of collegiality in spite of differences. The underlying philosophy of this strategy for intervention is based on my PAR (Preservation-Accommodation-Re-patterning) model which has been effectively used in

multicultural counseling training. This model provides a strategy to maintain a sense of equality during 'cultural collisions'.

Barriers to Implementation

Cultural change in any setting is difficult and will not occur without some degree of resistance from both faculty and students. First, group members who are most effected may tend to resist change that involves only recommendations from an external source, that is not mandated by the profession, or that which is suggested by only one member of the group. In other words, individuals may not commit to any new behaviors without having had the opportunity to personally contribute to the principles or shaping of the content of the programmatic proposal. Though this proposal is a model for how others might proceed, this is only one example. Engaging all faculty in the process of developing a program document is critical. In addition, allowing students to review the faculty developed document in order to fine tune the statement of principles and procedures would also be important. Providing forums for faculty to explain their collective rationale, once clearly defined, for the development of such a document and to allow students to air both positive and negative reactions would also be imperative to the process of cultural change. Faculty must be in as much agreement about the necessity of a Programmatic Statement as they are about the necessity of a Research or Counseling Theories course.

Second, although there may be no openly expressed disagreement with the rational nor the procedures proposed, some faculty and students may resist cultural change. Given the 'political correctness' that is associated with attention to diversity, some members of the faculty and student groups might hesitate to speak out against anything that is related to cultural change

due to the need to accommodate diversity. For example, those who currently have the most strongly represented voice might see this change as one which will 'de-power' them or at least minimize their influence in some way; those who have lived with silence and/or in isolation may not trust that they will be heard or respected in spite of the invitation by faculty. Some may have become comfortable in the existing culture, given that the existing norms are those that are most familiar. Though this might initially be perceived as disappointing to program members who have committed both verbally and behaviorally to the principles stated within the guidelines, this resistance is an essential component to the process toward cultural change. If principles are adhered to by those who choose to abide by them, forging onward with the participation of those who are committed in spite of the 'closeted' resistance should benefit both the willing and the unwilling. This stage of cultural change may also serve as a test, assessing the level of commitment of the program to develop and maintain a respectful and accommodating climate. Though the development of a written statement representing the 'collective intent' of a program is not an idealistic end, it is a critical beginning to developing new norms.

A third barrier is the presumption that some penalty for noncompliance to the guidelines must exist. Instead of viewing the model as a means of reward and punishment, these guidelines might be perceived as an additional opportunity for some students to receive feedback from faculty as a whole about relationships among their peers outside of the classroom setting. This feedback might be relayed in annual review letters and finally in letters of recommendation required for the internship application process and during job searches.

On the other hand, faculty must agree to attend to overt violations of the spirit of the guidelines. One source of tension and confusion for both faculty and students might be cases wherein one of the parties refuses to attend a scheduled meeting to address the 'collision'. It

would appear very important that these decisions be made prior to such an event and that well-defined criteria for 'violations' be identified and relayed to students during recruitment, interview, orientation and throughout the training experience.

A fourth barrier is the development of a systematic means of evaluating the effectiveness of the implementation of the model. Will the current climate really be improved or will the implementation of such a programmatic guideline create chaos where there was peace? On what criteria will the effectiveness be assesses? Over what period of time is an outcome expected? These are just a few questions that must be considered before, during, and after the development and implementation of a programmatic model. This author does not recommend change for the sake of change for programs in which trainees' cognitive and behavioral flexibility are already being systemically enhanced in terms of effectively working with others in spite of background, cultural, and racial differences. However, ongoing assessment of the climate is important not only for purposes of accreditation, but for relaying to students an interest in their emotional well-being during the training experience.

A fifth barrier, and probably the most powerful, that will be discussed is the initial open expression of negative feelings and resentments that might surface among faculty in the development of the document or in assisting students in negotiating their differences. Students' issues might reflect unresolved and unspoken issues among faculty. Anticipating this outcome as a normal part of implementation might assist in effectively and moving through the process. Though doing so might be difficult at first, new levels of communication among faculty will result. The model requires personal and professional stretching and growth for both faculty and students, consequently challenges will occur and a commitment to meet these challenges with respect, patience, collaboration, and cooperation is imperative.

References

Steward, R.J., Davidson, J.A., & Borgers, S.A. (1993). Racial majority vs. minority status: A study of interactional styles of successful Anglo students on a predominantly Anglo university campus. Journal of College Student Development, 34, 295-299.

Steward, R.J., Gimenez, M.M., & Jackson, J.D. (1995). A study of personal preferences of successful university students as related to race/ethnicity, and sex: Implications and recommendations for training, practice, and future research. Journal of College Student Development, 2, 123-131.

Steward, R.J., Morales, P.C., Bartell, P.A., Miller, M., & Weeks, D. (1998). The multiculturally responsive versus the multiculturally reactive: A study of perceptions of counselor trainees. Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 26, 13-27.

Appendix

Programmatic Proposal Addressing within group diversity among trainees

as a part of professional development

The _____ program is committed to maintaining an atmosphere which: values and appreciates all unique perspectives that students bring to the training arena: and, encourages cognitive and behavioral flexibility which will enhance cross-cultural interactions among peers and with clients. We have historically included a one-semester multicultural counseling course as part of the required core curriculum. However, we have recognized one critical training limitation which has resulted from this tradition. Trainees currently leave training with general counseling competency which can at times mimc multicultural counseling competency however, maintain an inability to sensitively (tone), respectfully (verbal response), and effectively (follow-up) address points of contention that commonly occur among peers. Consequently, trainees' skill development in maintaining effective working alliances with those who are " different" is often left to chace. the probability for the development of factions and student alienation increase with individuals' unwillingness and/or inability to resolved 'cultural collisions' (Steward, Gimenez, & Jackson, 1995). Trainees are then less prepared to thrive and survive in work environments wherein these skills will be required. though individual faculty members are often called to intervene in the negative aftermath of an interpersonal problem, there is currently no full-faculty, programmatic model for prevention of long-term problems among trainees. though faculty members' silence may initially be perceived as easier, the identification of the 'problems' as opportunities for introspection and learning would result in a more effective colleague. the cost of continuing to ignore these

learning opportunities will reinforce cross-cultural incompetence, a state that we all would like to avoid.

Recognizing the challenge involved in addressing this deficit has resulted in a faculty decision to do what few other programs have done: develop a programmatic model that provides procedural guidelines for addressing and responding to interpersonal glitches that are certain to occur among training cohorts with a critical representation of diversity. The purpose of this paper is to provide a brief description of the model for prevention/intervention of 'cultural collisions' among trainees.

Prevention/Intervention Model for Cultural Collisions

First, trainees must be aware of the normalcy of cultural collisions. Some students arrive with the idea that "appreciation of diversity' is and should be easy, and are frightened or angered at any point of contention that arises among peers. Some students arrive expecting that their unique area of diversity should be valued moreso than others, particularly when values are in direct opposition or in competition for attention in the mainstream media. Factions arise. Majority representation often rules; while, minority representation loses. this dynamic is typically exacerbated by perspectives of student factions with faculty allies. All such outcomes arise out of the expectation that one perspective or interpersonal style must reign and others must not. These outcomes arise when the development of cognitive and behavioral flexibility is not the primary goal of training.

First, trainees must be aware that there are patterns of responding to 'difference' which increase the probability of a negative outcome as well of those which do not. this increased awareness would compose the prevention component of the model.

The following are basic steps for addressing cultural collisions which distinguish responses that are reactive to those which are responsive.

SPIRIT OF SELF-PRESERVATION		SPIRIT OF SELF AND OTHER PRESERVATION
Negative Outcomes	vs.	Positive Outcomes
1. What is wrong with him/her?		1. What is going on with me that I am responding this way?
2. Sharing cultural collision with personally biased social support network persons for self validation and/or publicly embarrassing the other person in front of your support members.		2. Going directly to the person with the issue to seek understanding of their reaction and to share yours; using support network to seek mediation and possible resolution and understanding.
3. Outcome-based attitudes with winning or outdoing as a goal behavior.		3. Non-outcome based behavior changes tone of all interactions; win-win situation results because an accurate conceptualization of who one in relation to another is attained.

The positive outcome activities allow students opportunities for assessing their personal responsibility in maintaining the negative outcomes of cultural collisions. Students also have some guidelines for assessing when there is a need for faculty intervention. Student orientation, instructors of the multicultural counseling course, the professional seminar and Ethics course might commit time to present an overview of these guidelines and discuss potential barriers to compliance.

Second, trainees must be aware that they are not alone in developing skills in attending to the diversity among themselves. Trainees must know that they are not expected to be expert in 'fixing' interpersonal problems given the status differences which can exist among student cohort

(i.e., alliances with faculty, interpersonal style differences, popularity with other students, etc.). trainees must be aware that full faculty assistance will be available and that no perspective which promotes divisiveness and alienation will be reinforced verbally or in silence. When guidelines have been followed and negative outcomes prevail because of unwillingness or inability to effectively address points of contention, trainees will report immediately to his/her advisor. The advisor(s) will then present the case to the entire faculty for discussion and the generation of alternative strategies toward resolution. The following is a set of guidelines for the second part of this model, the intervention component.

1. One or both of the trainees report the 'collision' to respective advisor(s) with a typewritten detailed description of the event or set of events.

2. Advisor(s) inform(s) the program director in order to place the discussion of the event on the staff agenda. Expediency would be key, and a special staff meeting might be called in order to address the issue immediately. Only those reports that involve two people will be addressed. Trainees must assume responsibility for reporting their individual collisions with another.

3. During the staff meeting, faculty would review the written reports, hear the views of each of the parties involved, consider the match between the reports, and work together with the individuals to offer recommendations toward resolution (i.e., faculty mediation, counseling, etc.).

4. Follow-up reports after faculty recommendations will occur.

The intent is to support the notion that working toward the maintenance of effective alliances is a normal part of professional development and day to day professional life.

Summary

"Valuing diversity" must reflect not only a commitment to increased representation of the diversity among student groups, but a recognition of the ensuing positive outcomes which will lead to increased cognitive and behavioral flexibility and more cross-culturally competent professionals. Strategies or models for attending to this rare opportunity would appear imperative. Even in programs wherein the representation typically associated with 'diversity' (i.e., gender, race, ethnicity) is minimal or nonexistent, the necessity of training in collaboration and negotiation with those holding different perspectives, with different interpersonal styles, and different values should be critical if we are to alter the culture of many of our often times very stressful and competitive working environments. This would seem to be particularly true where racial/ethnic diversity abounds. Total faculty guidance and participation will turn these interpersonal glitches into opportunities for enhanced cognitive and behavioral flexibility for all trainees. Our program recognizes these meaningful and critical learning experiences in trainees' professional development.